SHAKER COLLECTION

Item 319

Book of notes and criticism,
1853, 1881, by [?O. C. Hampton]
of Union Village, Ohio

1863-1881
Notes and Criticisms
[by O. C. Hampton?]

PAPERS
OF
SHAKERS

319

OHIO
Union Village

1853

A Book of Notes & Criticisms.

On two pamphlets Lately Published in the East

Dear Friend, I now attempt to redeem my promise of reviewing the Harvard pamphlet, claiming William Leonard as its author on the title page; but proving to be the joint work of the said author and F. W. Evans of New Lebanon.

The work about to be reviewed is entitled, "A Discourse on the order and propriety of Divine Revelation & Inspiration."

In reading the first discourse to p. 16 we forget that the author is treating of the "Order & propriety of Divine Inspiration" and find ourselves agreeably entertained with a discourse on the Order of Generation and its vast abuses. If it had properly belonged to his subject, the author might have amplified largely to very good purpose. It must, however, be observed, that he follows the common error of supposing that the Adam who was put in Eden, and forbade the work of propogation, to be the same as the Adam of the first Chapter of Genesis who was commanded to multiply. "That is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural and afterward that which is spiritual." There is an evident absurdity, in supposing that God first commanded the man to multiply, & then immediately threatened that same man

with death if he should obey that command. And there is a further inconsistency in supposing that the Divine Being declared to Adam, that whenever he should touch the work of propogation, he should surely die, when at the same time he intended that some day he should do it. But as this is the doctrine of the Fathers, the brother is not to be blamed. This common error, however puts all the writers on that subject in an awkward position, and leads to such apparent if not real contradictions as we find in the note at the end of this section; and others which might be noticed.

After stating in general that the true law of nature for the propogation of the human species was kept through ten generations of the antediluvian patriarchs, and declaring emphatically, that Noah was "perfect in his generations", and praising his "unbending conformity to the laws of nature", this note denies the whole statement. Thus, he says "The true order of nature being once lost by Adam's transgression, in violating it, he died thereto according to the penalty annexed, and it could never be fully regained", &c. I should conclude that if Adam actually "died thereto", so far from keeping it only "in a good degree", he

could not keep it at all, any more than a dead man could perform the functions of a living one. Especially as "Cherubims and a flaming sword were placed which turned every way to keep the way of the tree of life, meaning the way of full restoration to the natural order, from which he was thereby debarred as a necessary consequence of his transgression, according to the inevitable penalty annexed to him and his posterity"

It is rather a ludicrous idea that there was such a solemn parade of "Cherubims and flaming swords" to keep that "dead man" from the tree of life, or from doing that which he was "dead" to, and had no disposition, or power to perform, of course, impossible for him to perform.

We have formerly held that the death which Adam died was to the spiritual life or order; but we are now informed that it was to the "true natural order" of propagation!

This is so contrary to our old prejudices that it is hard to swallow, and it sticks mightily in the throat to admit that the "tree of life" "means the way of full restoration to the true natural order" of making babies! "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life"! How Paul did miss the mark when he said "To be carnally minded is death"!

In the second section of this discourse the author has kept closer to his subject, than in the first, and upon the whole has wrote much to the purpose. One slight mistake I will notice. P. 23. v 30 Thus we have the prophets [John Baptists] own declaration, that he was taught by the spirit of the coming Christ." Not so. "He" that sent him to baptize was God, not the "spirit of the coming Christ." We are not trinitarians — we do not believe the athenasian creed, to wit, that "The Son [Christ] is God". On p. 58 of the work under review, it is declared that "Christ is not God," and consequently God is not Christ. Therefore it was not the spirit of the coming Christ that taught and commissioned John to Baptize; for it is declared that "there was a man sent from God whose name was John."

Discourse 2d. P 43. It is reported of an author, however erroneous or eccentric his sentiments maybe, that he will at least be consistent with himself. Here, in the first v. It is asserted that "God is Spirit — the Essence of all worlds & all existencies". A description of Deity almost sufficiently liberal to be subscribed by a pantheist.

The next verse informs us that, "There is an element

termed God". Here, God, the Great "Essence of all worlds and all existencies", is suddenly diminished to "an element"; i.e. one of the elements — a mere constituent principle, and this God or element "is the inner life or element of every being & element (that is good) in all worlds". He has nothing to do now with the worlds themselves — he is no element of them, but only of the "beings & elements" appertaining to them — indeed only a part of these — merely "such as are good". The 3rd v. shows the "element" of the other part. "There is an element termed devil or evil which is the inner life of every being and element that is evil in all worlds". So then after being told that "God is the Essence of all worlds & all existencies", we are immediately surprized with the assertion that, that all existencies, are divided between two elements or Gods — the good God & the evil God! A more palpable contradiction cannot be made. For if God is the Essence of all worlds & all existencies, there cannot be any single world, being, essence or existence independent of him, or that does not derive its existence from him; consequently there can be no room left for an independent existence or element, "termed devil or evil". So then our author must either give up his independ existence of

evil or devil, or dispensed with his "God, the essence of all worlds and all existences". He cannot have both. If he gives up the latter and divides the Universe between his good God and his evil God, the consequences will be disastrous to all hope or prospect of the final triumph of goodness. If after we have adopted this belief "we reason from what we Know" we must infer that the "evil element" or God constitutes the greater "inner life" of by far the portion of intelligent beings, and of course he must be much the greater God of the two. Of the inhabitants of other worlds or planets we know nothing, but with regard to this earth we are certain that 99/100 of the most exalted beings that inhabit it, have their inner life from the evil God, and of course belong to him. Reasoning from analogy we may conclude the same of other worlds of the universe; that is, if we adopt the hypotheses of the author.

I pass over the 4th verse, which tho rather unintelligible, it might be considered hypercritical to notice

Verse 5th is quite intelligible — good plain common sense — considered per se; but in order to quadrate with v. 2 & 3 the words "progress devilward" should have followed the word "sensuality. Thus; "As we increase in spirituality our progress is Godward

and as we increase in sensuality we ~~increase~~ progress Devilward. To be carnally minded is "Devilish" but to be spiritually minded is "Godlike"

Verse 6th [printed 5th] about the "Christ sphere", contains an astonishing piece of intelligence; yet we must consider it an entire figment of the authors immagination, unless he claim it as a revelation. Certainly the quotation from Job cannot be pressed into the service to prove the astounding hypothesis, that there is a vast world filled with nothing but Christs, kept in reserve, to be sent out as saviours to other worlds!

Verse 8th He seems to quote Christs address to his Father Jn 17. 18, to prove the existence of the "Christ sphere" or world. But it seems strange that he should venture to wrest this scripture by an exposition so glaringly in contradiction to that published to the world in the "Testimony of Christs Second Appearing". The same may be said with regard to Joh 8th. 58. Our author evidently quotes these scriptures to prove the preexistence of Christ — that he existed "before the world was". Now let us turn to the Testimony, p. 504, v. 38, third edition. "Again said Jesus before Abraham was I am". This was strictly true, but in what sense!

"Not in relation to the period of his existence; but the dignity of his order" D. "Again it is said that Jesus prayed for the glory which he had with the Father before the world was. What ever ideas the natural man may have from the littoral words of scripture, the plain truth is this — Christ Jesus in whome dwelt the fullness of the Father knew what was intended in the mind and purpose of the Father for him; therefore when he had finished the work which the Father had given him to do, he prayed saying, And now O Father glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee [that is, which was in thy mind and purpose concerning me] before the world was." Thus the text is clearly explained so as to exclude the doctrine of Christ's preexistence. The same writer further observes; "Again, when the apostle said, 'God hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, according to his own purpose & grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began', he could not mean the old world, for neither they nor Christ Jesus existed in the order of time before the old world, but long after. Therefore it is written 'Thou art my son, this day I have begotten thee', which could not be the day

in which David wrote: for again he saith "I will [in future tense] be to him a father and he shall be to me a son. And when he ~~brought~~ bringeth the first begotten into the world he saith let all the angels of God worship him". Which was expressly fulfilled when the tidings of his birth was brought to the shepherds, four thousand yrs and after the visible creation began, and never before". See also p. 505 where there is more to the same purpose. Thus all the texts which have been claimed to prove the doctrine of Christ's preexistence are cogently argued to mean no such things, and the contrary doctrine is strenuously & plainly asserted.

So much then for the Christ of our world, and if there exist a Christ-sphere, he did not come from thence, according to the "Testimony," which has been the standard of Believers faith and doctrine for the last 46 years.

I will only add on this subject a pertinent remark from an ancient rabinical author, as a further elucidation of the above exposition, and as a specimen of oriental style. "Three things were created before the world, namely, the Messiah, Israel & Jerusalem." Which means that God

had these first in his mind, and created the world for their sake. This is the gorgeous, but common eastern style of expressing the author's high veneration for the things mentioned.

As for the doctrine of the "Christ of Iowa" or world of Christs, stored up to be sent out to other worlds or planets, the writer of the Testimony, as flatly contradicts it, as he does Christ's preexistence. See. Ch. 1. p 3. v 19 "It never was intended by the Creator of all things, that any part of creation should be redeemed or governed by a foreign power; for that would have laid the foundation for confusion, and shown a lack of wisdom in the whole order of things natural. But God proportioned to every part of creation its own internal government without dependence on foreign aid or fear of foreign invasion. And therefore when Christ Jesus came into the world as the Redeemer and ruler, he did not come descending through the air, from some remote part of space, but being born into the world as all other men are, he was qualified, commissioned & sent of God while dwelling in the midst of those he came to redeem, and over whom he was ordained rule;

[redacted] And thus were fulfilled the words of the prophet 'Out of thee shall he come to me that is to be ruler in Israel'. Plainly showing that in the order of things, the power of redemption would arise out of that creation itself which needed a Redeemer." Now I would ask of what use is this "Christ-sphere" and the order of beings who inhabit it, if their advent into other worlds would "lay a foundation for confusion and show a lack of wisdom in the whole order of things"? Of what use are they if in the "order of things salvation must arise out of that creation itself which needs a redeemer"? It may be remarked that if the writer of the Testimony had been combatting this "Christ-sphere" doctrine in a special manner, as a dangerous heresy, he could scarcely have been more pointed and cogent on the subject than in the above quoted remarks.

When the early Catholic fathers undertook to deify [redacted] they were constantly perplexed by Marcion & other heretics by such scriptures as, "The Father is greater than I" "Of that day and hour knoweth no man not even the Son, but the Father only"; &c; till some lucky genius hit upon the doctrine of the "hypostatical union", or two natures

in Christ, "very God & very man". This pernicious doctrine with the means of playing hocas pocas; and all the tricks of theological legerdemain were adopted to establish their favorite dogma. When Jesus declared that the father was greater than him — when ignorant of what the Father knew — when weary or hungry it was the man. But when he said "Before Abraham was I am" Oh, it was the God that spake. Thus the greatest inconsistencies could be reconciled. And it seems, that since the grand discovery of the "Christ Sphere", and that we can now talk of what "Christ through Jesus" performed, we have hit upon a similar doctrine — two distinct persons — very Christ & very man, included in the Messiah! We are now prepared to play dodge as well as the Catholic Fathers, and thus reconcile all the above seeming contradictions, between the publication under review & the Testimony.

I certainly recognize the perfect right of our brother to hold just such opinions as appear to him correct, and to publish them too if done in union. But I sincerely wish our publications to the world were consistent with themselves and with one another. The Testimony, Manifesto & Millennial Church

all contradict one another, and themselves on some very material points; and I was pained to see the late editions of the two latter works, made without any important revision, & with all their errors! Every new publication seems to widen the differencies and add to the embarrassment of those who have to meet the objections of critical outside readers; & I heartily wish that greater caution were used in comparing, before setting afloat new publications. The reader will pardon this digression.

The learned reader must be well aware that this doctrine of two distinct persons in Christ, is not new. It was invented by the ancient gnostics to elevate themselves above the odium of following a "crucified jew", and was the first step toward the finally established doctrine of a Trinity, which our author so justly abhors. The early fathers improved on the gnostic doctrine, and from considering Christ as an ancient & high created intelligency from the great "Pleroma", or "Christ sphere" they invaded the very throne of Deity and established him as "Coequal with the Father himself! The writer of the Testimony was by no means ignorant of this gnostic doctrine; yet he

no where adopts it; but directly disavows it as shown above. The doctrine was still rejected as late as 1823, when the 3rd. edition of the Testimony was published. In that edition, which was printed under the eye of Father David, the original writer, Richard M'Nemar, Matthew Houston & others a note was introduced in the margin, as a further explanation of Christ's address "And now O Father glorify me &c." This note is intended, as any one must see to strengthen the original position, & put down the doctrine of Christs preexistence. The said note reads thus: "The Divine Nature with which Christ Jesus was glorified was with the Father before all worlds". Here it is not Jesus, but Christ Jesus, considered as one person; and it is the "Divine Nature" - God himself with which this one person Christ Jesus is glorified, and not a created being from the "Christ sphere".

P. 49. v 80 "Spirit cannot see matter". This is asserted not proved. "God is Spirit", and it is an astonishing thought that he has produced all the wonders of creation — the whole material universe blind-fold! "He that formed the eye can he not see?". Reasoning from analogy we would rather suppose that created spirits, formed after Gods' own image could

also see matter, and that they possessed vastly increased perceptions, so as to recognize further degrees of the unsearchable wisdom & skill of Omnipotence, in the molecular & atomical structures of a thousand objects, which escape the material organs of sight.

P. 55. v. 21. Here, it may be remarked that most readers will probably dissent from the statement. The author speaks of man being created male & female, and observes that, "In this consists by far the most important part of the image and likeness of God." If this be the case then all the lower orders of animals were also created in the image and likeness of God as well as man; for they too are male & female. The grisly bear and the hyena are as much in the order "image & likeness of God" as man. When it is said that God created man in his own likeness, we do not suppose that this means the same likeness & equality which existed between Adam & Seth, of whom it is written that "Adam begat a son in his own likeness". Man's being created in God's own likeness, doubtless consisted in those moral qualities & physical powers of mind, in which man resembles God, and which distinguishes him from all the lower animals.

P. 56. v 26. "A trinity is an inovation upon the theology of the human race. All mankind - from the most enlightened nations and classes, down to the most benighted heathens - believed in the duality of Deity until the creation of the Trinity by antichrist". There are sweeping assertions and show that the author was not well posted up with regard to ancient mythology & theology. Hutchinson in his "Trinity of the Gentiles" shows that most of the ancient nations, mentioned in scripture worshiped a trinune principle. The Magians were supposed to have been an exception, yet according to the doctrine of Zoroaster they believed in one Supreme & two subordinate Deities, & of course in a Trinity. They considered one of the subordinate deities a God of light, the other a God of darkness, yet all three were worshipped as Gods, tho' they held the God of darkness to be the creator & author of evil.

The Hindoos, from the most ancient records to the present times, have worshipped a Trinity, Brauthe Vishnoo & Chiveen. Thus most of the Asiatic nations were trinitarians long before the Trinity was created by Anti Christ. The Greeks and Romans and probably other nations had male & female deities; yet their Neptune had his trident, and their pythonic virgins or mediums

always sat on a tripod when giving forth oracular inspiration. The Jews before Christ were not trinitarians, and it is just as certain that their theology never admitted a "duality". If they rejected and abhorred a Trinity, it was not in favor of a Duality; they are, and always have been, strictly unitarians. And even if we should admit that every individual of the human race outside of the jewish nation "believed in the duality of Deity" anterior to the "creation of the Trinity by antichrist", the rejection of that doctrine by the jews must render the above statement of our author negatory.

The western nations of Europe, the ancient Britons, Gauls & Germans are said by historians to have worshipped a trinune principle. And this is the probable reason why, in the great Arian contest when the unitarian doctrine was espoused by all the eastern nations of Christendom, and was at one time almost triumphant, it was finally overturned by the power and influence of western Europe: because the trinity was more congenial to their preconceived opinions.

But after Hutchinson has gone to the pains of showing that the ancient gentile nations were trinitarians, I conceive it to be a very poor argument in favor of the doctrine of a Trinity,

that many or all the heathen & unenlightened nations, who, according to scripture, "Knew not God", believed it. An argument drawn from the same source in favor of the duality, must be viewed in the same light. Would it be any additional proof and credit to the revealed religion of Jesus Christ to say that many or all the heathen fools and philosophers had believed & promulgated the same before him?

P. 57. V. 31 The same sweeping assertion occurs. "All the religious sentiments of the ancients whether written or oral attest the principle of male & female in Deity." This may be referred to what I have written above. But one query presents itself. Is the author right certain that he is perfectly acquainted with "All the religious sentiments", and "all" that the ancients ever wrote or spake on the subject of "Theology" so as to feel entirely safe in venturing such an assertion?

The next verse refers to Philo, the famous jewish Plato, as he is called, and quotes his remarkable doctrine on the duality. I will only say that the first time I read that passage, it detracted greatly, in my mind, from the glory of our revelation, on that subject. I had, till then, supposed that

this great "mystery of Godliness", had been concealed from the foundation of the world, until revealed through Mother Ann; and I felt that the claim of that honored medium to originality was in some measure tarnished. I can add nothing to our testimony, especially to our claim of a modern revelation of this doctrine, that Philo or any other philosopher, discovered and promulgated 1850 years ago.

P. 57. v 33. "Jehovah implies male & female", Ed, and v. 34 We have the testimony of Michelangd, that "Jehovah means (litterally) Her-She." Our brother may be much more profoundly versed in the Hebrew language, than I can pretend to be; but from the little smattering I have had of that language, I should think myself quite too credulous, if I were to admit the statement of Michelangd. The sacred name Jehovah is plainly and gramatically derived from the verb היה (hajah) to Be, Exist, and according to both the gramatical inflection, & the cabalistic sense, the transposition of the י (jod) & insertion of the ה (vau) shows the word יהוה (Jehovah) thus formed to be a name & that of the BEING & Existence to whom that name belongs is Eternal & Self-derived; and so may be expressed by The Essence - HE who is - The Self-Existent. Indeed the authors definition

of God, p 48. v 1 - "The Essence of all worlds and all existencies" is not a bad exposition of the word Jehovah. Altho' I do not dispute, nor does it seem to me that any logical mind can deny that the Being who is called Jehovah must contain in his Essence as much the female as the male principle, yet it will never be admitted by the learned that the word or name Jehovah, "litterly" (literally) contains any such idea.

P. 5 [illegible] v 41 "Jesus was not the Christ". The author in making this bold and wonderful assertion, contradicts himself, the Testimony, and the Scriptures, and seems to misunderstand the meaning of the word Christ. First, he contradicts both himself and Peter, p. 75 v 1 where he evidently, himself adopts Peters sentiment. Thus he says, "Peter declared Jesus to be the very Christ." But here he affirms that "Jesus was not the Christ"! A more palpable contradiction cannot be made. It is directly declaring a thing to be & not to be. Second: He contradicts the Testimony. P. 401 Ch. 5. v 1. "And as the man Jesus was for that very purpose endowed with the spiritual unction or anointing power of the Holy Ghost, therefore he [the man Jesus] was called Christ; that is the Anointed. Here, the Testimony plainly asserts that "Jesus was called Christ", while our author as

plainly declares that "Jesus was not the Christ". Third: He contradicts the Scriptures. Matt. 1. 16 "Jesus who is called Christ"; but our author says "Jesus is was not the Christ". Again, Acts 17. 2. 3. This, Jesus whom I preach unto you, Is Christ; but our author says Jesus was not the Christ!!?

Fourth. He misunderstands the meaning of the word Christ. It can not be applied to a class or order of beings who are created such in their rudimental or normal state; but designates a man, or human being, appointed by proper authority, and commissioned to perform some particular work, or fill some office, & is an official title. What then are we to think of a whole class, "sphere" or world of Christs, without business or any commissioned employment? It is just as absurd as to talk of a sphere or world of apostles, or a whole kingdom full of nothing but kings, without crowns thrones or subjects! The simple and literal meaning of the word Christ is the Anointed; that is, the person anointed. Jesus was the person who was anointed; therefore, Jesus, & no other, was the Christ. The application of the term was derived from the ancient custom of actually anointing the prophet, priest or king, with oil as a ceremonial of installation into office.

John asks "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ" (1 John 2. 22) our author stabs out boldly & asserts "Jesus is not the Christ!"

Hence any person set apart or commissioned of God or man to perform any particular work or mission was called the anointed or Christ whether litterly anointed or not. But it was always the person, the man that was the Christ and the proper use of language will admit of no other application of the term. The apostles (especially Paul) appear to have used the term with considerable latitude, but it is easy to show that in all cases reference was had to the man Jesus, who was called Christ by way of pre-eminence, because set apart to the most important office ever intrusted to mortal man. If Paul wrote of preaching Christ, he meant preaching the doctrine and faith which was first promulgated by the man Jesus, the same as to "read Moses", means to read the law first promulgated by Moses. If he spake of "Christ being in you", he meant the same temper, faith & spirit which was manifested in the man Jesus, and so of the rest.

If even we should admit the gnostic doctrine, that some high intelligence, or individual spirit came from the Pleroman and took possession of Jesus, yet Jesus would be the Christ, & not that "foreign" spirit. The "Testimony" speaks of the

"anointing oil, with which the jewish Kings & prophets were formerly anointed", being "a figure of the unction or anointing of the Holy Spirit". This anoint-ing or Holy Spirit, is very distinct & different from the anoint-ed or Christ. By reference to the Old Testament this may perhaps be more clearly elucidated. The person - the man anointed, whether prophet priest or King, is certainly signified by the Hebrew word מָשִׁיחַ Messiah & the Greek ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ Christos. See John 1.41 "We have found the Messiah (מָשִׁיחַ) which being interpreted is (ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ) Christ, and they led him to Jesus". So, Jesus - the man was plainly the Christ & not oil. The unction or anointing was called in Hebrew שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחָה Semen meshe, in two words, something very distinct, both in sound and sense from מָשִׁיחַ Messiah, which always designated the prophet, priest or King - the man that was anointed with the שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחָה Semen meshe or anointing oil. (See Exod. 30, 11 & 37, 28 et. al.) In the New Testament, the "unction" or anointing is signified by the Greek word ΧΡΙΣΜΑ (Chrisma) and not Christos (ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ. (See John 2. 20-27). If, as the Testimony says, "the anointing oil [שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחָה] of the jews was a figure of the Holy Spirit", this cannot make it a figure

of the Messiah or Christ. The priest - the anointed man was the proper figure of the Messiah - was the Messiah for the time being. The Holy spirit was the chrism, anointing, not Christ, anointed.

But our author not only says that "Jesus was not the Christ", he also asserts that "Christ was not God". Yet, according to the Testimony, above quoted the unction with which Jesus was anointed, and by which he (Jesus) was constituted the Christ was the Holy Ghost or God; and consequently, not a created spirit from a "foreign" source. From this it would seem that his "foreign" spirit was neither the anointed nor anointing, and had nothing to do in the matter.

Our author says (p 58. v. 41) Christ was a created Being, who was commissioned &c"; consequently a person. Why does he in v 48 twice emphatically use the pronoun "it" in reference to this person, as tho' he conceived of it as a thing & not a person?

P. 77. v 9. "The primitive Church in forming a common interest, are said to have had favor with the Jewish people"; and our author thinks no wonder, since "they were making the greatest sacrafice for the God of truth of any they had ever seen, read or heard of." Now so far as the mere consecration

of property is concerned — and this is the subject matter — we may presume, that the Jewish people might have "heard" or "read" of & even "seen" the Essenes, whom Josephus so fully describes as making this same kind of sacrafice.

P. 60. 50 [Omitted by oversight in its place] "It thus appears that Christ was an invisible spirit, whom those who sinned could neither know nor see." It cannot be admitted that the saying of John, that, "He that sinneth hath not seen Christ neither known him" proves that "Christ is an invisible spirit". An invisible spirit can no more be seen by a saint than a sinner! In all humility I do consider myself a saint, tho like Paul, the least of all, and yet I never saw an invisible spirit in my life, nor expect any other invisible things. The very expression "He that sinneth hath not seen Christ," proves to me that Christ was not an invisible spirit, because it supposes him to be such a being as any good honest man could see and acknowledge. The wicked scribes and Pharisees could neither see nor acknowledge Jesus as the Christ, but as one possessed of a devil. As soon, however, as good honest Andrew saw him, he both recognised & acknowledged that Jesus was the Christ. See John 1st, 41, 42, where Andrew said to Simon, "We (They denied Jesus being Christ as stoutly as our author!)

have found the Messiah, which is, being interpreted, The Christ. And he brought him to Jesus". So then the Christ was Jesus, and not an invisible spirit.

P. 60. v 61 The author thinks that "no one can possibly avoid being confused in his ideas in reading the history of the doings and sayings of Jesus Christ ... unless they understand and bear in mind, that sometimes he spoke in his own name as a man of earth, and at others, of Christ "who came down from heaven". That is, plainly, unless they admit that Jesus and Christ are two distinct beings or persons. But I confess for myself, that without admitting this doctrine, I am no way confused on this point, but can as easily reconcile all that is said in scripture on this subject, with the doctrine that Jesus himself was the Christ, as I can reconcile any one doctrine of Believers with the scriptures. The author evidently founds his proposition on the unenlightened notion of a local decent, and assumes that to "come down from heaven" must mean to come from some remote upper region of space. But to come down from heaven — to come or be from above, simply

means to be sent by divine authority, or commissioned by divine apointment. Hence Jesus asks the Jews, "The baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven or of men?" Was it by divine apointment or was it from beneath - the mere invention of men?

If Jesus said "I proceeded forth and came from God"; he himself explained it in the next verse; "neither came I of myself, but He sent me". It is evident he had no allusion to local decent or to the mode of his coming into existence, but to the source of his authority and mission to introduce the new dispensation of the gospel. "To come", therefore, "from God" means nothing more than to be "sent by divine apointment, or to come with divine authority", and that he did not assume to himself to be a teacher, nor teach by mere human authority, as did the scribes & Pharisees. The same thing was said of John Baptist. "There was a man sent from God". Did he too come from the "christ-sphere"? Or are we to understand simply that he preached and baptized by divine authority? What is true in this case, is so in the other.

P. 61. 4 The author asks, "Did Jesus come from above?" and answers emphatically "Nay!" His mind is still fixed on a local decent

this question is however sufficiently answered about and his "Way" clearly refuted, only as it relates to a local deity and in that sense the "way" will be as correct in regard to Christ as to Jesus or any other being. But he proceeds; "He [Jesus] was made of a woman; made under the law - born in a stable". One would think this, putting down Jesus low enough; but not content he proceeds; "He [Jesus] that is of the earth, is earthly, and speaketh of the earth". "He (Christ) that cometh from heaven is above all; and what he hath seen and heard, that he testifieth;" "I proceeded forth and came from God".

o

I know not the author personally, but I have respect enough for his character, to make it exceedingly offensive to me should I see such language applied to him. That John Baptist really intended to declare to his disciples and the Jews who came to him that Jesus whom he had formerly declared to be the "Lamb of God" - that he should intend to say that this same Jesus was "of the earth earthly" no man can, it seems to one, on sober second thought, for a moment admit. The term "earthly" is connected

by James with "sensual" "devilish". If "Jesus was of the earth earthly, and spake of the earth," he must have "minded earthly things" and consequently must be classed with such characters as Paul mentions, "Whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is their shame, who mind earthly things"! I will not however pass over this injudicious exposition with ~~a view to refute it~~ trying to ~~but~~ exhibit the true & simple sense of the words of John.

When the Baptist said "He that cometh from above is above all," he spake of Jesus (and no other) His "coming from above" had no allusion to the mode of his advent, or to his coming from some "distant sphere", but to the source of his mission — his "coming" as a teacher — being sent by God to teach &c. The words paraphrased as follows will give as I think the simple meaning intended by John. "He that cometh commissioned from above, is superior to all others". "For [v. 34] he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God". This "Lamb of God," — "this Jesus," whom God hath sent" is superior to all earthly teachers, who come of their own will, on their own authority or the mere authority of men. For, "he (the sense) that is of the earth is earthly and speaketh of the earth". Thus

John contrasted Jesus" with the Scribes, and not with the Christ and rested the fact of his being divinely sent on the superiority of his doctrine to theirs. He was heavenly and spoke of heavenly things - "the words of God"; they, the Scribes, were "earthly and spoke of the earth." "He, Jesus, spoke as one having authority and not as the Scribes." (see John 3: 31-34) X

P. 62 v 8 "So neither could there be any true Christians", i.e. in the first appearing of Christ! If there were no true christians, those who assumed the name must have been all false or anti-Christians: there can be no middle class. "He that is not for me is against me" said Christ. But our author doubtless expected to be understood theoretically: for immediately afterward he speaks of "primitive christians", and of the "doctrines of real Christianity" revealed in that day." And finally, he states, in conclusion, that "if the people called Shakers do not exhibit and show forth with an increase, before all men, the faith, spirit, doctrine & principles of the primitive Church, that must decide". I suppose he means, that must decide that we are not "true christians". After unchristianizing the Primitive Church, declaring none of them to be "true Christians", and of consequence spurious, I can not exactly

X The ground of the brothers great mistake was that John Baptist drew a comperison & contrast between Jesus and the Scribes Whereas he, making two persons of Jesus & Christ, made his contrast between them. The following loose paraphrase will, I think, give a fair illustration of his doctrine.

"He (Christ) that came from above is above all; but This Jesus, did he come from above? Nay! He was "made of a woman"; made under the law"- born in a stable! "He" (Jesus) "that is of the earth is earthy" — a sensual earthly devilish kind of of a fellow — and is always "speaking of the earth" and earthly things."

WHOLESALE PRICE LI

OF

MEDICINAL HERBS, ROOTS, B

Prepared by the

UNITED SOCIETY OF BELIEVERS. UNION VILLAG

NET PRICES.

Aconite leaves	$0 25	Elm Bark	12 cts,	Poke Ber	
Aconite Root	25	False Bittersweet	20	Poplar Ba	
Agrimony	22	Fennel seed	15	Poppy le	
American Hellebone	30	Feverfew	15	Prickly a	
Angelica Root	20	Fleabane	12	Quaking	
Balm Gillead Buds	60	Foxglove	25	Queen M	
Balmony	20	Frostwort	25	Queen's I	
Bayberry	15	Garden celendine	12	Raspberr	
Beechdrop	15	Golden seal	15	Rhubarb	

the appropriateness of claiming that we have the same "faith, spirit, doctrine & principles of that spurious church, and that "with an increase"!

A number of minor inconsistencies I pass over and bring this already too protracted review to a close.

In conclusion I will say, that, though I have used great freedom in pointing out the errors of this little work, I feel nothing but love for the authors. I have not been thus plain because I loved them less, but because I loved truth more: and where truth is concerned we must not be biassed by personal considerations: we must not consider who wrote but what is written. If my remarks should seem severe to them, they may console themselves with the consideration, that it is easier to point out the faults of a book, than to write one that is faultless — that "Books as offended are as men", and it is their common fate to abound in imperfections. So they have the common lot of authors. The sagacity of Job led him to discover this fact in his day, which caused him to exclaim, "O that mine enemy had written a book"! He had no doubt he could point out errors enough to mortify & put him to shame.

Strictures on a work entitled "Tests of Divine Inspiration. &"

By F.W. Evans of New Lebanon.

In the authors preliminary remarks, p. 8, he has the following: "The mathematician first begins with self-evident propositions, such as all men would admit; as that one & one make two; that the two equal parts of an apple are equivalent the one to the other, and then he proceeds logically, step by step, to the deepest and most sublime problems. This, as far as the nature of the subject will admit, is designed to be the method of procedure in the following treatise." In our strictures, we shall have occasion to point to this proposal, and show wherein the author has in various instances signally failed in fulfilling his "design".

In the very out set it is asserted that "Man is now in fallen condition." This is not self-evident, and therefore needs proof; and the more so; because the work is written expressly for the "Spiritualists"; who have quite generally been taught by spirits that man is not in a fallen condition – that in his original state he was created on the very lowest plain of moral and intellectual perceptions, susceptible of progression; and that

he has progressed from his low savage state of primitive ignorance, step by step to his present comparatively elevated condition in art science and morals.

The question is asked whether "Man is the product of Nature or of a Supreme Being"? And taking the "fallen condition for granted, the reader is thus interrogated: "If Nature were the author of man, and she be perfect, then it may with propriety be asked how her child man became imperfect? We cannot scarcely perceive why this question is asked unless it be to suggest the absurdity of supposing "Nature" to have been the author of man, and thus to make it quite evident that the "Supreme Being" must have produced him. Yet we cannot see why "perfect Nature" should be required to preserve her child man from imperfection, any more than a "perfect Supreme Being" should be required to do the same. The suggestion fails of its purpose, since it may be just as pertinently asked with regard to the Supreme Being as of Nature: Thus— "If God the Supreme Being were the author of man, and He be perfect, then it may with propriety be asked how his offspring man became imperfect?" If the first shows that man could not have been the offspring of perfect Nature, it equally shows

that he could not have been the offspring of a perfect God: consequently neither proves nor suggests any thing to the purpose.

Again, it is asked, "How it happens that Nature which possessed the power to bring man into existence a perfect creature, should ever have suffered him to become any thing other than what she at first made him?" This also may with equal propriety be asked in relation to the Supreme Being. And if when asked in relation to Nature, it shows that she could not therefore have produced man, it as conclusively shows the same of God. If it shows one it shows both; and if it does not show either, then it is altogether negatory & shows nothing to the purpose.

Further, it is asked; "If she, Nature, lacked the ability to keep him perfect when he was so, how can she possess sufficient power to restore him to that condition? or to keep & preserve him in it, supposing him to be so restored?" Who cannot see that this question is as applicable to God as to Nature? And if because she lacked ability to keep man perfect when he was so, she is therefore incapable of restoring man to that condition, then the same must be true of God. It is a proposition of the author that "man is in a fallen condition"; and if it be a logical conclusion, that because his Creator lacked ability to keep

him perfect when he was so, that therefore said Creator does not possess sufficient power to restore him to that condition, this conclusion must be as true in relation to God as to Nature. The arguments and conclusions are like the authors "two equal parts of an apple" — they are perfectly equivalent. If no other arguments than these have been presented, can be found, why man is not the offspring of Nature we must be left to conclude that it is quite as probable that nature produced man as that God created him, since the arguments apply with equal force to both the one & the other. But it is of little consequence from which of those sources man derived his existence, since he is in a "fallen condition" and according to the authors argument his Creator, whether God or Nature, can never restore him. Man's case seems to be hopeless! Alas! to whom shall he go? Nature, even if she be perfect, cannot restore him, and the "Supreme Being" is equally impotent, seeing he evidently had not the ability to keep man perfect when he was so. We shall, perhaps, when we read the next sentence discover why, according to the authors logic, neither Nature nor the Supreme Being could reform man. "The product of

Nature, man, could not have fallen unless Nature also fell"! If this be true of Nature as the Creator of man, must it not be also equally true when predicated of God? Then the argument logically stands thus: "Man is in a fallen condition"; but man the product of God could not have fallen unless God also fell! Ergo, God did fall! How is it possible then that he should be able to restore man?

We have only however quoted enough of this sentence to show its logical weakness; we will here give it in full.

But I do not mean to garble, nor treat one unfairly; therefore I must quote this whole paragraph. "The product of Nature, man, could not have fallen unless Nature also fell, for he could not have been a free agent; as Nature could not bring a free agent into being; for free agency presupposes two opposite powers, controlled and directed by two primary antagonistic intelligencies or Beings"! Here, again, it must be observed that the reason assigned why Nature could not bring a free agent into being, is, because, "free agency presupposes two primary antagonistic Beings". This however assumes that God himself could no more bring a free agent into being than Nature; and as completely denies that God is the Creator of man, as it does that Nature created him. (Besides, if two antagonistic powers are neces-

By this the first proposition is denied & abandoned.

sary to the production of a free agent, it is just as rational to suppose some power or Being antagonistic to Nature as to God. Those who hold that Nature is the author of man, consider Nature as a primary power, and it is only necessary to suppose another primary power antagonistic to Nature, and then man as a free agent can be produced, upon our authors plan, and God out of the question.[1] Consequently the scheme completely fails to prove what was intended, to wit, that man is the offspring of a Supreme Being – God.

But, to a mind, the least acquainted with logical sequence the absurdity is perfectly palpable, that two antagonistic powers should cooperate to produce the master-piece of creation! Antagonistic powers work against each other; and it is impossible that they should be antagonistic & at the same time assistent & cooperative in producing so glorious a result as a "free agent" – just as impossible as for a thing "to be & not to be".

When it is granted, for arguments sake, that Nature could produce a perfect man, we do not intuitively see she could not have made him a free agent, since free agency in the authors sense of the phrase is absolutely essential to the

[1] See Appendix A.

to the existance of man. Nor does the reason assigned why Nature could not make her man a free agent, namely, "Because free agency presupposes two opposite powers, controled and directed by two primary antagonistic intelligencies or Beings", in the least helps us out of the difficulty. So far from seeing that freagency presupposes two Eternal, Self-Existent Antagonistic Beings, the bear proposition overwhelms the mind with the idea of its profound absurdity! The propositions are not as plain as that 2 & 2 = 4

The author himself, on the very next page, gives an entirely different, and much more reasonable ground of man's freagency. Thus, he says, "Man in his sphere was not a machine but a free agent, to choose between obedience and disobedience, to good or evil. For it is impossible for man to be a living rational being without having sensible self-acting life and the power of choice must be the result." Here, it will be observed, that man's free-agency is made the inevitable result of his becoming "a living rational being". This shows that it was not only possible for God to create man a free agent, without the help or intervention of an eternal Devil, but it was absolutely "impossible" for him to make "a living rational being," without making him a

1) See Note. A in the appendix

preagency! According to this showing of our author, such a being as man could not exist without preagency; or, in other words, a being without preagency cannot be a man; as, in the authors opinion, such a being would be "a machine" and not a man. But if "preagency presupposes two primary antagonistic Beings", it follows, irresistably that God without the aid of the Devil could not have made man at all; and hence the Devil must have as fair a claim upon man as God and of absolute necessity man must have been the joint production of God & Devil! Hence the Devil must have as fair a claim upon man as God. Wonder if this is the ground of the calvinistic doctrine of "election and reprobation", and the reason why, as Burns says, God "sends one to heaven & ten to hell, all for his glory"! It must be confessed that Diabolus is rather greedy & takes a lion's share; but upon this hypothesis he has a fair claim to half.

But God could of himself make a man," or he could not. If he could do it, there is no necessity for supposing the existence of another primary antagonistic Being. If he could not, then he is not the Creator of man, and of consequence not his

God — not God at all! (When such utterly absurd results are necessarily deduced from a proposition, it is logical demonstration, that the premises must be false.)

The author, as has been stated, says, "Nature could not bring a free agent into existence;" and the reason he assigns is, because "free agency presupposes the existence of two primary antagonistic Beings". Who cannot see, that upon this supposition, God is incapable of creating a free agent as Nature? Yet the design of the writer is to show that God, & not Nature was the Creator of the free agent, man. So in the very next paragraph he asserts that "Nature was not the originator of man — that there is a Supreme Being — God +++ the author and creator of man". But if "free agency presupposes two primary antagonistic Beings", we may ask why does it presuppose this? It must be because there is no other conceivable or possible method of producing a free agent. If then it is impossible for one primary Self-existent Infinite Being to create a free agent, it inevitably follows, contrary to our authors conclusion, that "God is" not "the author and Creator of man". His arguments destroy one another. The absurdity of supposing an "antagonistic Being" to co-operate with his antagonist in producing a free agent has been already

noticed. (It must be observed that our author calls his "Author & Creator of man", "a Supreme Being." This can never be reconciled with the doctrine that there is another Self-Existent Being, perfectly independent of them. Therefore, for one, who asserts this latter proposition, to talk about a "Supreme Being, is supreme nonsense.)

I have, I think, clearly demonstrated, and that upon the authors own statements, that if God was the Creator of man at all he must have made him a free agent without the intervention or help of another primary antagonistic being. To show, how this free agent could sin or do evil, also without the intervention or help of said antagonistic Being, would be very simple; and will, I trust be made plainly to appear in the sequel. For the present, however, as our author has referred his readers to the whole catalogue of Believer's books and Dunlavy's Manifesto with the rest, I will quote a few passages from this work, to exhibit the views of its profound and logical writer on the subject of man's freeagency and peccability.

"But the atheist obstinately insists on a principle not granted, not possible, that if God be immutably good, his

This for W.R.

creatures cannot suffer any thing evil or disagreeable. +++ This principle supposed man incapable of transgression, which is neither granted proved nor possible, unless he could be equal to his Creator, which is impossible". Again, "The atheist contests the being of God and man's being his creature because man was created subject to many miseries, + making no account of an acknowledged and irresistable truth that happiness is the more consummate, and men appreciate it the better, when preceded by the contrary or contrasted with misery. It is therefore in no wise inconsistent with infinite wisdom power and goodness in God, that man was created capable of subjecting himself to miseries of his own procuring, that he may learn the better to appreciate his own happiness, when he is delivered. And these distressing miseries which the atheist objects to the Being of God as Creator and Governor, to which man is subject above other animals only argue his greater worth, and the greater degree of enjoyment to which his constitution points in the event: for the capability of great suffering indicates the capability of great happiness". The existence of that great "primary antagonistic Being", never entered that writers mind as an object of belief. He considered it "no wise inconsistent with infinite power

wisdom and goodness in God to create a man capable of subjecting himself to miseries or evils of his own procuring". This is the true orthodox doctrine of Believers with regard to the origin of evil. This is the doctrine we have been taught & imbibed with our earliest convictions of Believers faith; and have always and still do consider it true, rational & scriptural & consistent. Finally, this is the doctrine which has been published and promulgated to the world for 35 years, as the sanctioned faith of Believers on the subject. And, strange to tell! This very book containing this doctrine, is placed by the author at the head of a list of Believers "Standard Works", and his readers are referred to it as containing our true faith and doctrines. This he has done in the very work, in which he combats and contradicts a plainly avowed doctrine of this "Standard Book"! As sir Isaac Newton said to his little dog, when he had knocked over the lamp, set fire to his papers and consumed the labor of years, "Ah Fido, thou little knowest what thou hast done!"

But our author may, after all, still be puzzled to discover how man, who was created not only good, but very good, could of himself, without help from some "foreign influence",

err or do wrong. But if he had not the power in himself to disobey, then he was not a free agent; and if not a free agent, not man at all. If he had no power in himself to move, except in one straight line, as he was acted upon, and moved by his Creator, then he was certainly "a machine", which our author asserts he was not. But if it be supposed that man (if it be lawful to call such a thing a man) was created so good that he could not deviate from one straight line of obedience as moved by the Creator, without a foreign influence antagonistic power or Being", this latter power could not by possibility make a free agent of him: he would be a machine still. The necessity of being moved by a "foreign power" - a power or principle out of itself - is the very definition of a machine No reason nor logic can show that a machine would become a free agent, by being placed between two opposite forces, whether those forces were equal or unequal. If they were equal the machine would be brought to a perfect standstill, and be held in equilibrio; consequently could not perform even the work of a machine. We must suppose the "antagonistic" force to be the stronger before the machine

could be propelled the wrong way. It is equally true and demonstrable that if God made a thing so good that it had no power in itself to err, and his power constantly controlled that thing in a straight line of progressive goodness, that thing must continue forever in that direction, unless an antagonistic power greater than God stop its course, and turn it back from obedience.

Thus we discover by inevitable consequence, that the "Antagonistic Being" of our author was more than a match for his "Supreme Being." And after all the labor of getting up so terrific a monster, to help God make a free agent out of that beautiful machine propelled on so gloriously, it is discovered that this great antagonistic power would only stop it, turn it back, and play "smash" with it more or less. We are at last forced to the conclusion that this "foreign influence" is just the thing that will unmake, instead of make a free agent — that a free agent must have power in himself to choose between obedience and disobedience; instead of being impelled by a foreign influence, he must be absolutely free from such influence, and must be so constituted, that he can act freely from himself; in order for in the words of our author "self acting power

46 agrees with p 15

to be a free agent, and accountable for his actions. Finally, in the authors own words: "It is impossible for man to be a living rational being, without having sensible reflecting life, and [Devil out of the question] the power of choice must be the result" P. 54 We find the following: "The doctrine that 'there is no evil' entirely abrogates the teaching of Jesus Christ, which was exemplified by his life, sufferings & violent death, and which showed that both good and evil had a positive eternal existence; and that as the elements of good concentrate in and proceed from an absolutely good Being, so do the elements of evil concentrate in, and proceed from a Being absolutely evil. And it was equally impossible for the good Being to originate (directly or indirectly) an antagonistic being or element as it was for that antagonistic Being or element to create the Author and element of all good". The doctrine of "no evil" and that of the "eternal independent existence of evil", are perfect antipodes, and must be considered the two extremes of falsehood, between which truth must be found. God is a Necessary Being. Nothing cannot produce something: Nonexistence can not produce existence. But we know ourselves to exist, and are conscious of thousands of other existencies all around us and we must of inevitable necessity, refer our own

existences, together with that of the objects which we see to some Cause or Being capable of producing them. This absolute necessity which the rational mind is under to conclude Eternal and Uncaused Cause or Creator from the things that exist, is the reason of applying the phrase Necessary Existence to God. Pursuing the thought, we discover that a Necessary Being, is necessarily Eternal and Everlasting — uncreated, without beginning — Self-Existent, Independent, Almighty, having no previous being to limit, circumscribe or control him. Such a being must of necessity be wise and his Wisdom must be Infinite, as there is the same reason for the infinity of his wisdom, as for that of his Being. Being infinitely Wise he must perceive that goodness is infinitely better than evil — Love infinitely better than hatred or malice in a word, that the Benevolent dispositions are infinitely preferable to the Malevolent. And being independent in his existence, and consequently independent in his actions & choice, he must, of infinite necessity choose to be Good — to be Love — must be infinite in all his perfections Hence we say with logical and Mathematical certainty, that a Necessary Being is Necessarely Good, Wise, Perfect and we argue all this from the mode of his existence, from the fact of his being Self-existent & Independent. How is it possible, after

tracing matters thus far, logically to admit that another Being, can exist whose mode of existence is precisely the same, and that he can, nevertheless, possess a nature diametrically opposite — absolutely malevolent? Whoever asserts, that an Eternal self-existent Being can be absolutely evil & malicious, has no argument to prove that another Being of precisely the same mode of existence is absolutely good. Hence, when one author asserts that "God is essential, absolute and unadulterated good" he takes for granted what he ought to have proved, which is impossible for him to do upon his hypothesis

To admit the existence of two unoriginated Beings is so great an absurdity, that it can only be done for argument's sake; but when admitted, to suppose that these two beings whose mode of existence is precisely the same, and, nevertheless, diametrically opposite in their natures, is a tenfold more absurdity. If we admit two such existencies, we may with equal reason admit ten, ten thousand, or any number we please. But then unless because we have admitted one great absurdity, we grow reckless of reason, and assert every thing at random, we must still admit that these beings possess a common nature, and are necessarily similar in their attributes and dispositions. Any other

conclusion must overturn all the foundations of reason, and annihilate all the facts and experiences on which they rest. Of all the infinite variety of organic beings which surround us, the individuals of each species, whose mode of propagation and existence are the same, are absolutely similar in their natures. And this fact in the authors own language results from "laws far more enduring and unchangeable than the laws of the Medes & Persians" (Unless the axiom that "The same cause must always produce the same effect," be given up as false & absurd, we must suppose that these admitted primary beings, whose mode of existence is the same, must be similar in their character and nature). The inevitable consequence of this argument is, that after violating all logic and reason by the admission of so great an absurdity, as the existence of two or more primary beings, we gain nothing by it: we have not found an eternal source of evil after all. But two eternal independent Beings cannot be admitted. When the mind has rationally traced out, as above, the existence and attributes of One Necessary Being, it cannot logically suppose another, because one Being of Infinite power, wisdom and goodness is fully sufficient to account for creation. So, in strictness of language &

logic, there can be but one Eternal, Self-existent, Independent Infinite & Necessary Being. To suppose another is not only unnecessary, but absurd. There can be but one infinite space; if you suppose two you must set bounds to each, and this destroys the infinity of both: for infinity means without bounds. So if you suppose two self-existent beings, you undeify both; for there can no more be two infinite beings than two infinite spaces. Nor can either of them be "Supreme" each being independent of the other. To talk thus of, as the author does, of God as the "Supreme Being", is a supreme absurdity, since, he asserts another being wholly independant of him. But it will be affirmed, that after finding an efficient Cause for the existence of all good things, we still want an efficient cause for the evil. And it is urged, that since our Necessary Being is necessarily good & perfect, to suppose that evil originates from him would be to deny his necessary goodness. However distressing the necessity may be to discover the origin of evil, we cannot remove the difficulty by supposing an eternal self-existent evil Being: for in so doing we create a greater absurdity than a more unintelligible enigma than we remove. Whenever we assert, contrary to the inevitable necessity of rational

or Primary
deduction", that a Necessary Being is not necessarily good and perfect, we destroy the necessity of a primary evill being. If a Necessary unoriginated Being be necessarily good, then a Necessary unoriginated evil being is impossible; but if an unoriginated Being be not necessarily good, he may be imperfect, and have a mixture of good and evil in his character. If such a Being be not necessarily wise, & infinately so; then we are at liberty, if not under the necessity, to conclude, that tho' he may have some goodness and some wisdom, yet both are imperfect, and consequently such a being is liable to err and make mistakes in his plans, and to be disappointed in the results of his operations. Thus the origin of evil would be easily accounted for, without either the necessity or absurdity of supposing more than One Necessary Existence. So then the case stands logically thus: If a Self-Existent Being be necessarily good, there can be no self-existent evil Being; but if a self existent Being be not necessarily good, then God is not necessarily and unchangeably good, and may therefore be the author of evil: consequently we have no necessity, for a self-existent devil, as the author of evil. According to the first proposition, the existence of a primary evil being is impossible; according to the second

he is wholly unnecessary. This is as plain as that "one & one make two." If we cannot argue that God is infinitely good & wise from the mode of his existence, we have no method of proving that he is so. To assert therefore that "God is essential, absolute, unadulterated goodness", is but assertion, and is the very thing that he must prove, who denies that his goodness rests on, and necessarily results from his self existence.

3 Again, in the passage under consideration, our author says "The life, sufferings and violent death of Jesus Christ showed that both good and evil had a positive and eternal existence". This is not as plain, to my apprehension as that "one & one make two". I can readily admit that his "life" and merely showed that good had a positive and eternal existence; because he performed that which no man of himself could do. When he healed the sick, restored sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf cast out demons; that is, restored the maimed to reason, fed thousands on a few loaves & fishes & raised the dead to life, he showed a power of goodness which must be referred to an Eternal Good Being; and to this Being he did refer it. But his "violent death" showed nothing but what mere wicked man could do, and has done in millions of instances besides. He was cru-

cified as a malefactor and so were the two thieves that were crucified with him, and it took no more than human power and human malice to do either. It is absurd to oppose to an Eternal Power (Almighty) what mere man is able to perform, and which it is well known he has performed in all ages of the world, namely putting his fellow creatures to death. But our author continues, and asserts, "that as the elements of good concentrate in and proceed from an absolutely good Being, so do the elements of evil concentrate in and proceed from a being absolutely evil". The good manifested in the life of Christ, as we have seen, was infinitely beyond human power, and consequently we are under the necessity of admitting that the "elements of good concentrate in & proceed from an absolutly Good Being, but the same cannot be said of the elements of evil (unless by "a being absolutely evil" man is understood) because mere man is capable of performing the act spoken of. And, that man is the very being which this act did "proceed from", we have the testimony of this same Jesus Christ, who knew perfectly what was in man, "Out of the heart [of man] said Jesus, proceed evil thoughts murders &c". Observe, he does not say they proceed from a "foreign evil source" than man, but had their source & origin in the heart (wherein he has "self-acting powers")

of man. No other or higher source need be sought. Our author further goes on to say; "And it was equally impossible for the God Being to create or originate (directly or indirectly) an antagonistic being or element, as it was for that antagonistic being or element to create the Author of all Good". This verily it is so, for such an antagonistic being as our author supposes, never did exist, nor never can, (except as a caphear in the imagination of an uninlightened mind.) The thoroughly illuminated mind contemplates, God, who as our author says is the "Essence of all worlds and all existencies"; the whole universe is full of his glory and presence. No dark corner is left for an antagonist of the Infinite Being to creep forth from, and invade by surprise, the dominions of the Omnipresent Jehovah. If man, as a free moral agent has broken the laws of his Creator, and injured himself, and produced evil and suffering to his race, yet he is surely too puny a creature to be styled the antagonist of the Infinite Being; and his finite evils are too insignificant to be set up in antagonism to the infinite goodness of God. X Goto p 55

If we take an enlarged view of the universe and contemplate the thousands of suns & systems of worlds, moving in the most

Pope says of Superstition. "Like from the rending earth, and bursting skies
saw gods descend, and fiends infernal rise +

perfect order & harmony, we find no traces of evil. All exhibit the existence of One Omnipotent Being, the very harmony of whose works, proves Him to be the sole arbiter of the universe. If another Being, Self-Existent, Independent, perfectly antagonistic, and consequently equal in power to the Good Being, did exist, whose very being is only evil", we should see "planets and suns run lawless through the sky". Counter suns and systems would be created, and brought into tremendous collision with those made by the Good Being; and instead of order & harmony, chaos and confusion would reign throughout the universe and give as unmistakable evidence of the existence & terrific energy of that bad Being, as the harmony which really exists, proves the nonexistence of such a Being.

If we decend from the contemplation of the illimitable universe to the consideration of the innumerable existencies that surround us, we see the same order beauty and harmony in every thing except man. In the words of our author, "The vegetable kingdom shows forth order, in all the infinite variety of its "productions. There is not a plant so vile as not to exhibit sym- "tom and beauty in its organization; each branch & twig & leaf

There fixed the dreadful, there the fleet abodes,
Fear made her devils and weak hope her gods.

"is but an outward manifestation of an invisible & eternal
"law". Here then we still find no traces of evil, or of the
action and power of that mighty malignant Being which
so haunts the immagination of our author. Again he
writes thus: "The animal kingdom from the microscopic
"insect to the half reasoning elephant is also subject to and
"governed by laws called instinct, far more enduring, and
"unchangeable than the laws of the Medes & Persians, and
"which (in a state of original freedom) lead them to do
"in all respects that which is for their best good and future
"welfare. This also cometh from the Lord of Hosts who is
"wonderful in counsel and excellent in working. (Isa. 28.29)"

So then, according to the authors own showing the whole
animal world is still governed by those unchangeable laws
of their natures in which they came from the hands of
their Creator, and consequently, yet remain "very good". We
yet find no traces of that eternal antagonistic power of evil. Surely
he can not be so very bad after all! Indeed, I begin to consider him
almost negatively good. Of all the innumerable hosts & varieties
of good, glorious, & harmonious things in the universe, after the
most diligent search, we can find only one single species, that

he has corrupted or meddled with! But in all sobriety can the existence of this little speck of evil, and that of recent origin, require the logical conclusion of the existence of an Eternal Independent Evil Being, whose dispositions are "only evil" to account for its production? As we have searched through all the universe, and find evil (moral evil) to exist no where except in man, is it not more rational to conclude that he originated his own evil? and that by the abuse of faculties and things in themselves very good?

In connection with the last quoted passage, concerning the immutable goodness of the "animal Kingdom" (p. 13) our author celebrates the glorious condition in which man stood in his primeval states, and to strengthen & prove his position quotes Eccles. 7. 29 "God made man upright". Does the author really & sincerely believe this? If so, I would further ask, if he believes this clause to be Divine Revelation, why he cannot believe the concluding one that follows this? "God made man upright but they have sought out many inventions": "They", not some evil being for them, but "they themselves" have sought out many inventions". Our author says 7. as Dunlavy says

on the same page (14) "By the insinuations of evil, operating upon his innate love of knowledge, man was induced to violate the great law of life". Why can we not rationally admit that "his innate love of knowledge", planted in him by God himself, & very good, may be perverted by man himself, seeing he was a "free agent having self acting life" and the power of choice to obedience or disobedience in himself", as the author acknowledges, without the "insinuations of evil" from a foreign source, and thus agree in sentiment with the wise man? We must notice that the innate disposition was the recipient of these "evil insinuations"

We have not only seen that the magnitude of evil, compared, with the order, harmony, & real good of the illimitable universe is very small - a mere speck, but we can show its history and chronology. There was a time when it did not exist - when every thing was very good, and consequently a time when it began to be: consequently it is not eternal. We have no such history or chronology of the beginning of Good. It was from everlasting. There is no statement in reason nor revelation of a time when every thing was "very evil", and a fixed time and manner when good was introduced and began to be. So that we find no first

parallel between the two as to the mode of their existence or their magnitude. Then, with regard to the ~~comparative~~ quality of the good and the evil respectively we find the same want of any parallel, or ground of just comparison. Good is the spontaneous efflux from an Eternal Self Existent Being, whom we call God; and is manifested in the productions of all the multifarious objects of creation, and their adaption to good and useful purposes. Evil is the perversion of good — sin, and its consequences — the rebellion of a created accountable intelligent moral agent against the laws of its Creator, and of course against the laws of its own best good. Therefore evil — moral evil could not originate from a primary independent Being. For a Being independant in his existence, is independent in his actions, and, owing no allegiance or service to any other being, he can not — cannot rebel, and of course can not have the nature of sin nor rebellion in him. It would be just as impossible for such a Being to "transmit" a sinful and rebellious spirit which he had not nor could possibly have in himself, even supposing him to have an opposite disposition to another "primary" Being, as it would for this other Primary Being to do the same

and the ample provision for every natural want

Our author says, "But if that which does not possess any evil quality cannot transmit it, so neither can God who is essential, absolute and unadulterated good, ever exhibit outwardly in his creation, that which is opposite to, and has no existence in himself — evil." If this is impossible for God, it is equally impossible for another Primary Independent Being to "transmit a quality" which he does not possess in himself — sin. It is therefore logically demonstrated upon the authors own principle that the sinful quality in man could never have been transmitted to him from any Primary Independent Being, whether we call him God or Devil. And of inevitable consequence we must look elsewhere for the origin of sin; and sin includes all the moral evil known in the universe, of the quality, of both sorts.

Again, with regard to the magnitude and quality of the good and the evil that exist, we may observe, that from a thousand suns & systems, and immense orbs that roll in order and harmony through illimitable space, down to the microscopic animalcula, or the least spire of vegetation, all of which are "very good", we find not one thing but what is infinitely above the power of man to produce, and consequently must of inevitable necessity trace the foot steps & handywork

of an Infinitely Wise, Good, Omnipotent, Self-Existent Being. But on the other hand, when we look at the magnitude & quality of the evil that exists, we find not one thing but what man is capable of performing & exhibiting.

Our author says (p. 57) "There are principles of good and evil, and these are reduced to actions — facts — by intelligent beings" This will not be disputed; but when he next asserts that, "There is the same amount & kind of evidence in proof of the existence of one as there is by which to prove the existence of the other", he states a most palpable error. He next enumerates a few of the evil dispositions as specimens, contrasting them with their opposite ones — "hatred, war, revenge, cupidity, lust;" and justly adds, "Persons subject to these passions & principles are real entities", and we may add that "persons" are the only "real entities" in existence that are subject to these passions and principles, and so far from these passions and principles "existing abstractly", they, in reality exist no where else only in "persons". There are no actions nor things, known to us, flowing from these passions and principles but such as are performed by mankind.

There is not one evil under the sun known to man

but what man can and does commit; while infinite numbers of things, good, glorious & grand, surround us on every hand, which man has no power to produce. How then can it be true that "there is the same amount and kind of evidence for the existence of a primeary evil Being as there is for the existence of a God one? Seeing there is no evil but what man can do we have very strong presumptive evidence, from that fact alone that he is the very culprit that originated it; and we find not the least necessity in the case to suppose a power infinitely above man, to produce what man himself can do.

Indeed, if there were no greater amount & kind of evidence for the existence of an Eternal Good Being, than there is for that of an evil one, all mankind (except perhaps our author) would be atheists!

If I could believe in the existence of two Primary antagonistic Beings, I would devoutly beg pardon of either of them for calling him Devil, and would respectfully state that I had only done so for distinction's sake and not out of any irreverence for so sublime a Being. For it is perfectly plain, if two such Beings

dæ ist, that the application of the term devil or evil to either of them must be perfectly arbitrary. Each character and principle would be the good of him who chose and possessed it, and there could be no evil in the case, only as each would be devil or evil to the opposite party; and this would be perfectly reciprocal. This must be so from the consideration, that a Being independent in his existence, is at perfect liberty, so far as other beings are concerned, to choose what he will be. And it is impossible for an independent intelligence to prefer misery to happiness — pain to pleasure — evil to good. Therefore, ~~therefore~~ whatever character or principle he might choose, must be good to him — such as would produce happiness. There could be no such thing as evil only relatively — nothing intrinsically — and ~~in itself~~ or evil in itself. Thus we see that the author's doctrine when traced to its legitimate results, proves precisely what he himself was arguing against, to wit, that "there is no evil". According to his hypothesis the malevolent dispositions can be freely chosen and adopted by a primary independent

intelligent Being, and consequently become his good; and make him just as happy as the Benevolent ones; and therefore they must of necessity be good in themselves and equally productive of happiness, or he could not choose them. In the energetic language of our author (p 57) "This is really commingling and confounding opposite and contrary qualities & things; if not overturning the foundations of sanity in the human mind"!

The proposition that the malignant dispositions cannot make an intelligent being happy is a self evident axiom, and consequently (that) it is impossible that a Primary independent being should choose, or possess them. This (has been considered) an insurmountable argument that a Necessary Being is necessarily Good. (I cannot see how) this argument can be overturned. But this annihilates at once and forever the doctrine of a Primary Malevolent Being. If there could be two primary beings of opposite characters, they must both be intrinsically good. Evil could only be the incidental result of their antagonism, for which they would be equally to blame. As, according to our author, it required their co-

I may be

opperation to produce a Free agent, so it would require their joint opperation or rather ~~collision~~ mutual collision to produce evil. But to talk of two antagonistic goods or good beings, is as absurd as to talk of antagonistic truths: yet this absurdity is involved in the doctrine of two Primary antagonistic Beings.

X The great Sophism in this marvelous paragraph we have been considering may be thus exhibited. It is first asserted that "evil had a positive eternal existence". But this tremendous position rests on no proof but "the violent death of Jesus Christ," which, as we have shown, is no proof at all. This mere assertion, as tho' it had been proved, or were self-evident, is stated as the predicate of the argument. The next step in the sophism is to show that this eternal evil "concentrates in, and proceeds from a Being absolutely evil". He has now got his "Evil Being, and as the evil was eternal, the Being from whom it proceeds, must be an Eternal self-existent Being sure! To make this still more certain the argument is continued: "And it was equally impossible for the good Being to create or originate, directly or indirectly an antagonistic being or element, as it was for the

antagonistic Being or element, to create the Author and element of all Good". All this string of consequences would be true if the predicate had been true; and we concede at least this much to our authors argument; that it was and is, and ever will be utterly impossible for the Good Being to create an eternal antagonistic being. But we cut the knot, and declare that the only reason is, that no such antagonistic Being ever did or ever can possibly exist. The predicate of the argument — the eternal existence of evil — is not self evident, it is not proved; its falsity (we positively assert) is perfectly capable of demonstration, and has been demonstrated. This being the case, all the conclusions drawn from it, fall to the ground. The argument is just as falacious — just as much of a sophism as the following. "The earth is a plane and at rest. The sun rises & sets once in 24 hours: therefore it is positively evident that the sun makes a diurnal circuit round the earth"!

3ly Again; if evil has an Eternal Self-Existent Being as its fountain, who is fully equal, if not superior to the Fountain of Goodness, then the evil (may and must eternally continue to exist, and there is no hope nor possibility of overcoming it, it must extend to God Himself. Beings of equal power and oppo-

site principles can harass and afflict one another. The combats of ants in their mole hill with all the pains and evils they inflict on one another reach not man — they are no evils to him. But man is a fiend to his fellow man; and they being equals and antagonists, afflict & torment one another. But their evils reach not God — they are no evils to Him; He is neither afflicted harrassed nor tormented with them. Nor neither thinks he has ever seen or even thought of them (see p. 58). So then as the evils of man were originated by himself, they must terminate in himself; they can reach no higher. And as man is a finite being, his evils are finite; for it is absolutely absurd to suppose that a finite cause can produce an infinite effect. The opinion that the evils of man reach not God, and that they originated in man himself, is well expressed by an apostle. "Let no man say when he is tempted I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted of Evil". Or rather THEOS APEIRASTOS [Theos apeirastos] "God is unaffected by evil, neither tempteth he any man; but every man is tempted when he is enticed and allured by his own lust, and when lust [his own lust] hath conceived it brought forth

sin". Here was an exceeding fair opportunity for the inspired writer to have introduced the "foreign source of evil" the Primary antagonistic Being as the source of man's evil, and indeed we think he must undoubtedly have done so if he had believed in such a doctrine. He begins by denying that God can be affected by evil or that he can tempt any man to sin. Why did he not inform us that man, instead of being tempted by God, was tempted by the "evil suggestions of a foreign enemy" a Primary antagonist of God? It is evident he knew of no such Being, he believed in no such doctrine. Hence he laid sin at the right door—to man himself.

P 57. "God and evil exist abstractly". This abstract evil, tho' a pure fiction, or figment of the fancy seems nevertheless to have been viewed by the author as a real entity. Every one who has in some good degree analized the human understanding, discovers that the mind constantly makes abstractions where none exist in nature or reality. Thus we make ideal abstractions, ~~[illegible]~~ exist of goodness, whiteness, blackness &c; but such abstractions have no existence except in our minds. For goodness cannot

exist only as it inheres in some being or substance capable of doing or being good; and so of whiteness or blackness they can have no existence only as they inhere in some substance capable of exhibiting the colors of white and black concretely to our sense of sight, & so to produce the ideas of blackness and whiteness in us. The same is true with regard to the whole class of abstract terms and ideas. If we should assert that white & black exist abstractly, the absurdity would be plainly manifest; and it must be equally absurd to say the same of good and evil; unless by abstractly we merely mean ideally & not really. It is therefore unphilosophic & erroneous to suppose that "good and evil exist abstractly." A thing is good or evil as it produces pleasure or pain; when it results in happiness we call it good & when it produces pain or misery we call it evil; and altho' the ideas & sensations of good & evil are distinct and opposite as much so as pleasure and pain and must forever remain so; yet nothing is more obvious than that these two sensations can be & constantly are produced by the same agent. How pleasant how good is fire in a cold day, at a right distance & proper quantity? How good, useful & necessary to our comfort in a thousand

ways! But if brought in contact with us what pain and evil it produces! How dreadful the evil! How terrible the calamity when this good thing produces the conflagration of cities and ships, and devours with insatiable fury of multitudes of human beings, destroying, as it some times does, in a few hours, the labors of centuries! The same may be said of water and a thousand other things. Our author is right when he affirms, a few paragraphs above that "Good is good in all the different stages and processes through which it may pass as is proved by its happifying effects upon all sensuous existencies +++ So also is evil evil in all the different stages through which it may pass, as is evident by the pain suffering and unhappiness to which all things and persons are subject in proportion as they are under its influence". Thus plainly does he make good & evil to consist in, and be distinguished by, the happiness & misery which we feel; and thus plainly have I shown that these opposite sensations of good and evil — happiness & misery are produced in us by the right or wrong use of the same good thing, and that the evil thus produced is the effect of man's own ignorance, carelessness, or design. And I —

have also shown that the existence of good and evil happiness and misery necessarily presupposes Beings & Things capable of feeling and producing those sensations. But it is impossible for mere abstractions either to produce or feel those sensations, therefore good and evil cannot exist abstractly.

Again: Our author, after stating that "good and evil exist abstractly" says; "Upon the hypothesis that either one of these had a beginning the other must have created it out of nothing". I have already shown that neither good nor evil can exist abstractly, nor can I tell why the author represents "abstract good and evil" as "creators", as tho' they were real entities (unless it be to produce a palpable absurdity, for the sake of showing his tact at over turning it.) Abstract good can not create evil nor any thing else, one whit more than mere ideas can create entities. The same may be said of abstract evil. Our author seems aware of this; for after enumerating the good and evil passions and principles, he says, "Persons subject to these passions are real entities". So it is not the abstract good and evil, but the persons who are good or bad that are the real entities: even so. He goes on: "For it is

equally as absurd to suppose that real evil could be made out of real good, as it is to suppose that real good could be made out of real evil. As he is talking about "abstract good and evil", all this labored logic is futile and utterly useless. no one will contend that the idea or sensation of bitter can be made out of sweet or evil out of good in the abstract. But that real evil can be made out of a real good thing is one of the most palpable and common occurrences of every day. The food set before us is positively good; and if we have an appetite, that too is good, and the sensation produced by eating is pleasant and good. But an over gorge of this same positively good food produces pain & evil. So simple and easy is it for a good thing to be productive of evil in this way, that most good men who have long since renounced the devil and his works, and have been translated from the kingdom of darkness to that of light, do, nevertheless, become active agents in producing this metamorphosis. And so it is with a thousand other good things, which are "good in their right use and evil in their wrong use". As I have thus plainly shown how real good things can be turned into evil, I will leave it to the authors to show how "real good can be made

out of real evil." And when he has pondered the subject and puzzled himself without being able to produce a single instance, he may possibly discover, that the reason why a good thing may be turned to evil & not vice versa, is, because Good is the One only Eternal Unoriginated Substance out of which every thing must be made, and that Evil is nothing but the perversion of Good by a Created free agent. Our author says (p 11) "All the faculties of man were originally good & innocent not excepting that of procreation". It was and is the perversion of these good faculties, that produced and still continues the evil. I do not of course agree with him that man was led to this perversion by "a foreign evil influence", and perhaps I have given sufficient reasons for dissenting.

Again: Our author says, (somewhat triumphantly); "To attempt to evade the absurdity of the proposition, that either of these principles or beings [i.e. Unoriginated good or Evil Beings] created its own opposite out of nothing by saying they first produced good or evil beings, & that these are to their own opposites, is unreasonable & disingenuous". (He auth seems to think he has got his opponent cornered safe

and therefore every thing comes primarily "very good" from the hands of the Creator or by a created free agent.

enough now, unless he should be so "unreasonable" as to make the evasion here pointed out. He may rest easy. We shall not "attempt to evade", but shall boldly "attempt" to demolish his argument, even at the imminent risk of being considered "unreasonable & disingenuous". The author gave us the promise in his preliminary remarks that he would proceed upon mathematical principles, and as far as his subject would permit, would make every doctrine and principle assumed as plain as that "one & one make two". It were sincerely to be wish that he had "attempted" to abide by that proposal. One of the reasons why mathematicians succeed so well in demonstrating their problems, is, that they first clearly define all their terms, and then constantly use them in strict accordance with their definitions. If our author had done this, I think he would himself have discovered some of his errors. Let him define, for instance, the precise meaning in which he always intends to use the terms 'good & evil', which he has so much use for, & I think the result would be the detection of his own sophisms. It has been demonstrated that an Unoriginated

Being is Necessarily Good — that a Being independent in his existence & actions must necessarily choose to be good — that such a being cannot sin or commit moral evil, having no law or Being to sin against. Consequently such a Being cannot be the author of or originater of, moral evil in any sense in which it exists in man. Good is not rebellion against evil, nor is it the perversion of evil; but evil is rebellion against, & the perversion of good, as has been shown. Therefore if it be not "unreasonable & disingenuous", it is absolutely absurd to rank good and evil in the same predicament as to their origin, and thus to institute a comparison between them as tho' there existed a perfect reciprocity, or parallelism in their origin and condition. The same thing cannot be predicated of good & evil reciprocally. Evil may be considered in a two fold view — physical & moral; but in whichever of these you view it — search" as deep and as far as you please — it will always be found that it consists in, and originates from, the perversion or wrong combination of principles and things, perfectly good in themselves. This demonstrates that good is of absolute necessity

prior to evil, and consequently that God is the only Eternal Unoriginated Substance. So then, the very best and most comprehensive definition of the term evil is "The perversion of good". Moral evil is the act or state of rebellion (and its consequences) of a created intelligent moral agent, by the misuse of faculties in themselves "very good". No other kind of being could possibly originate moral evil, nor could any other kind of being be subject to it. So far from needing a "foreign influence" of any kind to cause man to rebel, such an influence would entirely exculpate him: the sin must be laid to the charge of the "foreign influence".)

In reference then to the passage under consideration, I will so far agree with the author as to admit, that it would be perfectly absurd to suppose the existence of an unoriginated evil Being, who produced other evil beings; and that these last produced good beings or "their own opposites". But the reason I give for this is, that it is impossible, in the first place, to admit the existence of such primary evil Being. In the next place there exists not the least proof that any order of secondary beings ever existed who ever created evil in their primeval state

Search the universe through and you will not find one single being that is evil in his original creation or existence, so there is not the least trace or evidence of the existence of a Primary Evil Being. Consequently it is just as absurd to suppose the existence of these secondary evil beings as the first. But on the other hand. ~~Return the other hand~~ we may safely affirm, and clearly demonstrate the existence of One Unoriginated Being who is necessarily Good. This Good Being did create man, all of whose faculties, with the ten thousand objects that surrounded him, were "very good". This good man was constituted a free moral agent by his Creator, which positively implies "a power of choice" — a power to make a right or wrong use of his good faculties & other good things around him. And seeing God himself made and constituted man thus, it is the climax of absurdity to suppose the intervention of a "foreign power" — an enemy & antagonist of God — necessary to man's free agency. Consequently man had the power inherent in himself, as he came from the hands of God to pervert his good faculties and other good things in his reach. Man did abuse this power and thus became the originator of his own evil. If you ask me instance came

the disposition in this good man to violate his Creators laws, I will ask you whence came the disposition to exist in your good man to side with the Devil. ? (When you have answered this you will have answered your own question.) It is just as easy & much more rational to suppose that man's own good appetites would dispose him to eat too much as that another being should prompt him to do it; especially if he was so good that he had no appetite or the least inclination that way. If man - the good man as he came from the hands of his Creator, had any the least appetite, inclination or adaptation for any thing the devil proposed to him to use and abuse, God must have been the author of that appetite inclination or adaptation. Hence, even if we admit that the devil did prompt or persuade man to misuse any of his good faculties, God would still be as much the author of man's evil with the devil as without him. If God had not created man with such appetites, all the promptings of Satan would have been as vain as to persuade a man vomiting with the cholera to eat a hearty meal of beef and cabbage. Our author seems to have anticipated this argument, and therefore a little below undertakes to "evade" its

force by the following remarkable concession. "God exists in his own element, yet he could create beings with a capacity for receiving evil influences, as easily as a man can make a vessel out of pure materials, capable of holding the most noisome and poisonous fluids." Thank you for the candor of acknowledging that God "could" do this! It would not do to say right out that God did do it. And he could do it as "easily" as a man could make a vessel — it would not do to say as consistently. But illustrations are not arguments. This is a most pitiful "evasion" — a subtle sophism — as if man were a mere empty passive vessel, into which Satan or any one else might come and pour what he pleased! In the author's own language elsewhere, "man is a free agent, having sensible self-acting life and the power of Choice must be the result". So then Satan himself could not pour anything into this man, unless he exercised that power of Choice which God gave him to receive; and even this he could not do unless the thing offered were adapted to some God-given appetite. But, according to scripture, God did more than to create man with a mere "capacity for receiving evil influences;" and even more than to create in man appetites & combinations

which he might misuse to his injury and the consequent production of evil. "He planted a garden eastward in Eden into which he put the man" and "out of the ground God planted in the midst of that garden the tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil". It was "good for food" "a tree to be desired to make one wise". The serpent too - an emblem of the sensual principle which pointed the woman to this tree, was an animal which "the Lord God had made". However figurative these things may be considered, or however symbolized, yet the fact that all the things "concerned" in this affair - snake & all - were created by God, must not be overlooked. Not one hint - not the least foundation exists in this whole account of a "foreign influence", or of anything outside the pale of God's creation, having any the least agency in the introduction of evil into the human race. It is a sheer fabrication - a mere supposition taken for granted without the shadow of proof that the serpent was possessed of a foreign devil or primary evil being and so acted as a medium or agent of old Satan to instill his evil disposition into man. It is obvious that unless the man had been so constituted as to be able of himself to originate evil, he could not have been a "free agent".

With regard to the "tree of knowledge", the author of the "Testimony" says "It was good in its right use & evil in its wrong use". And this is the case with all man's faculties and every object of use within his reach. It would take a higher intelligence than our author, to inform us how God could have created fire for the use of man, and yet have so constituted the fire & the man that it would not burn & give him pain, by coming into contact with it; or that the incendiary could not produce the conflagration of a city with it. The law that moves suns and planets, and holds them in their spheres & orbits, causes man to fall from elevations & break his bones or dash out his brains. God is the author of that law, but man is the author of his own carelessness or temerity. Every object in nature - the entire constitution of things - is calculated to produce pleasure or pain, good or evil as they are rightly or wrongfully used. But with regard to this notable illustration which we have been considering, we will respectfully propound to the author the following queries. Suppose a man should "make a vessel out of the most pure material", and set it where he knows his next

† See Tiffany's Monthly Vol 8 No 1 129

door neighbor and avowed enemy would fill it with "poisonous fluids", would any one think of blaming the poor passive helpless and unfortunate "vessel"? Would not every one think the maker himself was much to blame his enemy very mean, and the vessel quite innocent? So much for this sublime & luminous illustration.

Thus we see, that after all the labor and violation of logick & consistency in getting up an unoriginated monster of evil to exculpate the character of God, & help make a "free agent" — thus to account for man's evils — It is discovered that old Antag. is perfectly useless — he does not answer the purpose — and may be quietly dismissed. And tho' we necessarily arrive at the conclusion that man originated his own evil, we do not see that we are involved in what the author justly calls an absurd proposition, to wit, that "The Good Being created his own opposite out of nothing" How can such an absurdity be the result of the proposition that "God created a man who rebelled against him?" I utterly deny that God, "the Good Being" has an "own opposite" either created or uncreated; much more that he created such an opposite out of either nothing or something. And so

can show that this denial, and the proposition that God created a man that rebelled or misused his good faculties, is a paradox? The fact is the author "created his own absurd propositions", and one no way involved in the doctrine which he is opposing. And in his own words it is "unreasonable and disingenuous" to palm such an absurdity on his "opposite". [opponent]

The next paragraph reads thus: "If evil be evil, then it was an evil thought and design in the mind of the Creator - God - out of which he created it, and first brought it into existence, whether He Himself did it directly, or whether he did it by producing another being - man - to do it for him." I confess that this paragraph puzzles me more, and appears more like sheer nonsense, than anything I find in the authors work. He doubtless had a meaning in his mind different from any thing that can be made out of his words, and probably meant to make this absurd proposition a consequence of the doctrine he was opposing. But this has to be guessed at or supposed as no such thing is expressed; we must therefore consider the paragraph as it reads. Is it then indeed a necessary result of considering evil to be evil - to be just what it is - that "then it was an evil thought & design in the mind of the Creator -

God out of which he created it"? This is what the author says. What then would be the result of considering evil to be good, or not to be evil? Would it be the reverse of the above? We leave it to the author to determine. But he further declares that this astonishing result would be the consequence of admitting "evil to be evil" "whether God himself did it directly, or whether he did it by producing another being - man - to do it for him". No one believes that God did create man "to do it for him" nor that man did do it "for" him, but "against him". Nor would God be one whit less the author of evil by producing a man "with capacity for receiving evil influences" and leaving him to the devil to pour his evil into him. So then, if the fact of man's originating evil proves that it was first "an evil thought and design in God", the intervention of the devil will not alter the case; and this charge against the character of the Good Being, whether intended by the author, as his words imply, or not is, nevertheless, the logical result of his own argument.

His next paragraph is as follows. "An acorn could just as easily develope itself into an apple tree as (if no independent principle of being of evil have any existence) can man progress or develope himself into a being, the germanal principles of whose character God has not thought

of nor planted in him." Illustrations and comparisons when ill chosen serve rather to darken & pervert than to exhibit and establish truth. To compare man who is "a free agent having sensible self acting life & the power of choice", to an insensible acorn which only has the mere germ of vegetable life, is nothing but a cunning sophism. Is it any argument that because an acorn cannot "develope itself into an apple tree", that man a "a free agent having self acting life & the power of choice" cannot change his character — obey or disobey his Creator?

As to the assertion that "God had not thought of" the characters or condition that man might assume, it makes him to be a very ignorant thoughtless Being, and seems to contradict the statement in scripture that he forewarned the man saying; "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die". It does seem as if he had "thought" of it after all, and appears the more probable, seeing that He Himself had planted that tree of good and evil, and knew, & warned the man of its operation and effect. Here, it seems to me, was a most fair & proper opportunity for God to have revealed to the man the existence of his great Enemy & Antagonist and warned him against his evil machinations. Also he warned the man against was something which He Himself

had created. How shall we account for this neglect in the Good Being? We must either conclude that no such Antagonistic Being existed, or that if he did exist God was wholly ignorant of both his character & existence. Our author seems to favor the latter conclusion, as he represents the Good Being wholly incapable of comprehending the character & nature of his adversary "whose very being is only evil" — the germinal principle of whose character God had never thought of"! (see p. 58) I would ask the author, If God is stile ignorant of evil, & the bad Being from whom it flows — whether He is stile unable to comprehend, or "think" of it? If so, how did our author, or any other created being become so well acquainted with the nature and character of both, & so come to know more than the Omniscient Jehovah? For certain it is that God could not have revealed that to others which he himself is wholly unable to comprehend, or even entertain as an object of "thought". Or does our author think that God has increased in Knowledge, & Knows now what he did not at the creation of man? On his own words, has he "come to the sapient conclusion that his God has progressed, & has all the time been changing for the better?" (see p. 91) But we will hear him further in his attempt to prove God's ig-

norance by scripture, at a period long since man's creation which may lead us to the conclusion that he considers God unchangable or "unprogressive" in Knowledge & that consequently He continues still in his primetive ignorence of evil. "Thus saith the Lord, they have built the high places of Tophet which is in the valley of Hinnom to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart (Jer. 7. 30. 31). He never thought of it." ! .. ..

This, tho' it shows the author's settled opinion of God's ignorence of evil, must never the less be considered as sheer trifling & peverility — in fact, a down right irish bull. God commanded them not to do it, yet "He never thought of it"! (We should observe that the clause "neither came it into my heart", is evidently eliptical and the supplement may be thus made — "which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart that they would disobey me". This at least would show that God did not talk in his sleep & so not think of what he was saying when He "commanded them not" to do such things But the author follows up his subject and persists in proving his position from scripture, to wit that God is ignorant of evil. "For (says he) as God is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, so

He is of too pure a heart to think iniquity. The scripture here quoted is like the other, elliptical; "God is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity with approbation". Thus understood it will not clash with another scripture; "The eyes of the Lord are in every place beholding the evil and the good". But construed in the authors sense there is a direct contradiction between the two & they would of course neuterelize one another and prove nothing. Thus far then the author has failed to prove from scripture that God is ignorant of evil. Still however he quotes another— "Depart from me ye workers of iniquity I never knew you". What sort of a judge must that be to condemn entire strangers— those he had "never known", and sentence them to punishment without knowledge or proof of crime? The account indicates that he knew them well. How could he call them "workers of iniquity" unless he knew them to be such? I have a modern translation of the N. T. which reads "I never acknowledged you"; and this is the correct rendering of the greek word εγνων (egnon). Parkhurst in his Greek Lexicon thus defines it in its helenistic or jewish sense— the style used by the N. T. writers. "To approve, acknowledge with approbation". This makes the sense rational & just, and is

doubtless correct. The very narative in which this sentence is found proves it. It is addressed to those who assumed to be true Christians, without being such in reality & who on that assumption demanded the approbation & reward of their judge — "Depart from me, says the judge, I never acknowledged you nor your pretension — you are workers of iniquity".

I will hearly refer to Sec. 5th. Ch 1st. Let the reader examine the whole carefully & see if he can find one idea that can be of any practical use, to either spiritual, moral or physical purposes.

P. 50 There had been two jewish temples, prefiguring the two Christian Churches. And as both the temples were destroyed so was the first Christian Church." One would think that if the two temples really "prefigured the two Christian Churches"; and the first destruction of the first temple, prefigured the destruction of the first Christian Church, by parity of reason the destruction of the second temple would also prefigure the destruction of the second Christian Church! This awful catastrophe, though contrary to our testimony and general expectations, would quadrate exactly with the doctrine of a Millennium, and the title of "Millennial

Church," which we have assumed. If we are in fact a Millennial Church — a thousand year church — our church must be destroyed at the end of that period & give place to another — perhaps the Everlasting Church! This will make room for an antitype to the third Temple! The second temple built by Zerubbabel, having been destroyed & entirely removed, the third temple was built by Herod and & this third temple was extant in the days of Christ and was the one in which he taught the people. It was the destruction of this temple which he foretold; and alas! for the Third and Everlasting church, this its eminent type was sure enough destroyed! And shall its antitype, the third Christian Church be likewise destroyed, too? If so, what next? So much for types & their application

P. 103-4 "And every thing, in any soul, short of this point — "As Christ is so are we in this world" — This Christ-state being attained by All those individuals who compose the collective body or Church of Christ to stand appearing ++ no prophets required to teach the knowledge of the Lord; for all know him from the least to the greatest of them ++ in the (present) era (or Chh) the universal testimony of All is, that the 'serpent's head' (the lust of

the flesh) is bruised in them" &c &c Oh how devoutly I wish all this were true! I would travel to the ends of the earth to see such a Church - such a great salvation!

I have now extended this review beyond what I at first expected, and perhaps beyond the limits of the reader's patience, and by dilating have perhaps diluted a weakened, rather than strengthened the positions I have taken. Though I have been somewhat diffuse, the importance of the subjects considered seemed to demand it; and if it were unnecessary to say more, I could scarcely satisfy my self with saying less. There still remains a number of passages of minor importance, which are objectionable, but which I shall pass over in silence, except a few which I shall briefly notice, and a few others to which I shall merely refer the reader.

In the "Summary" on p. 14, I past over without observing that the author after his logical labor on pp. 9 & 10 to prove that Nature did not produce man, had repudiated his own conclusion. He closes his argument on the above subject in these words; "It is therefore clearly demonstrated that Nature was not the originator of the human race".

Here [p 14] he declares that "Man [is] the microcosm of the world, and the product of Nature, under God"! It is true that the saving clause "under God" modifies the matter some, but the main point which he had before logically disproved & denyed is not only here assented to but asserted to wit, that "Man is the product of Nature". This is good-natured by meeting the materialistic doctrines at least half way; of which I think we ought to be cautious.

See the last paragraph of Sec. 4th Ch 4 p 45, where the power to cast out demons or "spirits" - evil spirits of course - such as was exercised by Christ and his apostles, is claimed for our Church, and consider whether we are prepared to be put to the proof of our ability to do this. Nothing is clearer to my mind than that the possession of demons were simple cases of insanity. I have known many such cases among us and have never witnessed any more power in our possession to restore such to their "right mind" than other possess.

But if even we admit that other distinct & evil spirits enter into men in this day and take possession of them I have no evidence that we as a church or people possess so decided a power to cast them out as to warrant us in giving out

such a challenge as the above.

See a paragraph p. 55 which begins thus: "Man having been originally created" &c, and let Believers consider whether we are prepared to expect & prove to mankind, that "sorrow and sickness, sighing & tears" &c will be totally extinct in "the Millennium". Without considering the absurdity of our assuming the title of "Millennial Church" - i.e. Thousand years Church, while we have always professed to have the "Everlasting Gospel", and of course to be the final and Everlasting Church, we ought to consider whether we have any reasonable proof or prospect for the entire extinction of "sickness" &c in our Church. If the Millennium has been in full operation with us for two entire generations, and we still continue subject to most of the maladies that flesh is heir to, where is the ground of such a hope?

P. 90-1 See article "Peace", and consider whether any religious professors in Christendom will admit the charge brought against them, to wit, that they had "come to the conclusion that their God had progressed, and was all the time changing for the better". I have never seen one man much less the "universal" body of religious professors

who would admit the truth of this charge. Yet the author says that "these erroneous and absurd premises are assumed by the professors themselves."!

Appendix — Additional notes

A. Our author at p. 10 says that "Free agency presupposes the existence of two opposite beings powers, controlled & directed by two primary intelligences or Beings." This makes "free agency" the consequence or effect of the existence of those two "primary Beings". On p 11 he says "Man in his sphere was not a machine, but a free agent to choose between obedience & disobedience to good or evil. For it is impossible for man to be a living rational Being, (if to be a man) without having sensible self-acting life; and the power of choice must be the result." Here, "free agency" is not the consequence of the existence of two primary antagonistick Beings, but the consequence of man's being "a living rational being". Hence there are two "antagonistic" arguments, or propositions. Again

The reason assigned why Nature could not bring a free-agent into being, is, because, "Free agency presupposes two primary antagonistic Beings." If then two antagonistic powers are necessary to the production of man — a free agent — it follows of necessity that One Being, without an Antagonist to help him, could not create a free agent. Consequently, God alone could not have been the author of man's existence.

Thus the above proposition of the author members it impossible that man should be the product of a Supreme Being, the very point he was trying to prove. This is so clearly an inconsistency that the "merest dolt" cannot help perceiving it.

Done at Waterville, Ohio 1853

New York Tribune June 25/58

At the Reformers Fra Convention

Mr Evans a Shaker Hailing from the town of Lebanon then made his appearance. He was glad that the time had come, when the question of the marriage relation could be discussed in an open convention. God is male & female, a dual Being. Man should be taught so to worship. He did not believe the Bible to be the word of God. It was simply the record of the high spiritual experience of the men whose composition it was.

Mr. Thomas Curtis of Phil.a made the following speech. "I was very glad to hear the remarks of Mr Evans, not because I believe there is a male God & a female God up stairs somewhere, but because it illustrates a very important position with regard to womans rights, namely, the perfect individuality of woman" &c

[Of course we must suppose, that the "perfect individuality of the "female God", was set forth as an illustration of that of woman; and consequently this "female God" is a distinct person, & if God at all, a distinct God from the male God, which without circumlocution makes two Gods!]

Mr Landon introduced Mr F.W. Evans a Spiritualistic Shaker. He proceeded to disabuse the public mind with regard to certain popular fallacies respecting Ann Lee and the Shaker Doctrines on the subject of marriage and went into a long disquisition on the doctrines of Shakerism & Spiritualism. The points which he discussed are as follows: The progressive idea of God in the human mind. God has been manifested many times to man. To Abraham, he was manifested as "the God of Abraham, Isaac & Jacob". To Moses "I am that I am". & "Jehovah", a word with a fem. termination indicating the the Female in Deity. Man goes through four planes of progression. The physical, Mental, Intellectual, then the Spiritual. Each of these planes has a corresponding spiritual sphere, in which is the heaven or hell of that plane or dispensation. From this sphere come the spiritual manifestations of its own plain. God is manifested first in the character of Father, but to Ann Lee he was manifested in the character of Mother. Christ was a ministering Spirit from the fourth heaven, the most superior spiritual being, that had ever ministered to the

human race, not even excepting the God of the Hebrews. Jesus (a distinct being from the Christ) was simply the first Christian man, and the only one until Christ made his second appearance to Ann Lee. The chief principles of Christianity are: Non-resistance No private property. Separation from the world or earthly Governments, A virgin or celibate life."

The apostolic Church was formed on a plane, a little below the Chh of Christ. The Gentiles Chh was formed on another plane, below the apostolic, retaining the doctrines of private property and marriage. The Roman Catholic Chh was on a plane still below introducing war and slavery. The Protestant Chh on a plane still lower, combining itself with the earthly governments. The Materialistic Chh is the last one and the lowest one. Spiritualism is the angel spoken of that "came down from heaven & the earth was lighted with his glory". The "Babylon the Great," of the Revelations is the Roman Catholic Church, and the Protestant Chhes are the harlot daughters.

By the second appearance of Christ all the principles above named were revealed to & established in Ann Lee & her followers. truth will stand

He then proceeded to state some of his experiences of Spiritualism running back he said as far as 27 years ago, and expounded the doctrines of Shakerism to a length, till he was requested to sit down, which he did!"

A fortnight after making the above extracts, when there had appeared two successive weekly notices of the above convention in the Cin. Gazette, we were visited by a couple of very respectable "Friends", One a stranger from N. Y., the other, Josiah Wright, a neighbor, long acquainted with, and very friendly to Believers. In the course of conversation he asked me if "I had seen the account of the Rutland Convention in the N. Y. Tribune — and the doctrines & ideas put forth by a pretended Shaker there?" I answered affirmatively & he again asked — "Do you believe in such doctrine as that?" I answered, "Nay, I neither believe in such doctrine nor in being caught in such company". He turned to his friend and said "Did I not tell you that that was not Shaker doctrine, and that he was a renegade shaker?" !! So it appeared that our kind "Friend" had been defending us against the aspersions cast upon us, by reason of Frederick's enunciations, & I was glad to let it go at that.

John Leifchild. "This singular man, it appears did not approve of Missionary Societies, and on one occasion, after warning his hearers against countenancing such delusions by contributing money to them,, he added:— "But remember this— the quarterly collection is to be made next sunday at Providence Chapel, Twitchfield Street, where I shall preach to you: and if you are not all much more liberal than you have been, by the living God I will preach to you no more"!" The result was satisfactory— The plates were so loded with money that hats were found necessary. This looks like a very succesful reduction to practice of the principle of making the best of both worlds". Westminster Review

A. "Notion" of M. Pecaut.— "That there is an absolute incompatibility between the essential conditions of spiritual life, and the idea of a mediatorial person or office. The mediatorship of Christ is in direct contradiction of the religious consecience."

The notion of M. Nicolas about Christianity. "The difference between Christianity and Judaism lies not

in doctrines, but in the very fact that Judaism was a system of teaching, and nothing more, while Christianity was a new Life."

Dr. Stanley's notion of Christianity: "To be like Christ; this is the one object which the whole New Testament impresses upon us." Stanley's 3 Sermons.

Notions of A. Thierry. "The Christianity of Jesus has been described as consisting in the renunciation of the world, and in the aspiration towards moral or spiritual perfection". "The Christianity of the twelve and other immediate followers of Jesus, after his death was a belief in a crucified and resuscitated Messiah accompanied by an extraordinary zeal for the Mosaic law. (Acts 21:20)" "The Christianity of Paul, rejecting all local distinctions, repudiated this very law"++ Asiatic Christianity appears to have been marked by certain metaphysical tendencies and a fanatical millenarianism; while Catholic Christianity in its turn is shown to have been elaborated by the speculative ability of Greece, & the administrative or organizing energy of Rome".

Eusebius - "We are told by Eusebius that the community of faithful Hebrews was governed by an unbroken succession of fifteen circumcised Bishops".

M. Maurice. "There was a set of men called Ebionites, the poor men of Jerusalem, the disciples of St James, who existed in the first century and survived into the second, and who maintained great exclusiveness toward the gentiles." — "In the Clementine homilies a partisan religious romance of the second century, St. Paul is made to play the part of Simon Magus, while Peter, by a strange theological metamorphosis is transformed into the apostle of the gentiles."

Origen & Chrysostom. Even such distinguished churchmen as Origen and Chrysostom seem to admit the reality of a primitive antagonism when they explain the dispute between the Apostles at Antioch as a concerted fiction. From the existence then of a Pauline and Anti-Pauline party in and after the Apostolic age, of an independent Pauline gospel, of the Judaic Christianity of St James & his elders, of the contradictions between the narrative of Paul and

That contained in the Acts of the Apostles – we are justified in concluding that the doctrinal system of the Twelve was not homogeneous with that of the true founder of Catholic Christianity, the noble-hearted & the larger-minded Saul of Tarsus."

Review of R. B's Positions of Good and Evil.

II "The principles of good & evil are real and substantial— not imaginary".

We first observe that it is not said Good & Evil are real and substantial, but the principles of good and evil. If by "principle" the writer meant the "original cause" we should have no objection to the position; but as the word in question is some what ambiguous and extensive in its signification we must decipher the precise meaning in which he intended to use it, from its connection in his writings. In the beginning to "Proof" to No II, he says, "If the principles or elements of good and evil be. Here he puts the word "elements" as synonymous with or explanatory of "principle"; and in this case the word principle must mean "constituent part; primordial substance". This latter phrase only signifies the thing or substance which existed "from the beginning", and not which existed eternally. If the word was used in this sense, I find yet no objection to No I, and so pass on.

II "They [the principles of good and evil] are, in themselves, sensible active and everlasting powers." There is considerable ambiguity in the word "sensible", and we are at some loss to know whether

What an association — "devils & Calves"! How much more natural & easy would it be to translate "goats and calves"? Aaron made a "calf" for an idol and the Israelites worshipped it, and we see no reason to doubt that goats also were made as objects of idolatry. What ever kind of devils these were, it is said that Jeroboam made them as well as the calves with which they are associated; and this makes it evident that they were images or idols of some kind, and not devils in any sense which this term is used. It is abundantly evident that ancient idolaters did worship goat-like images as well as those of the calf form, and doubtless the Heb. word here simply means goats as the other does calves.

In Ps. 106:37 another Hebrew word is rendered by devils, namely, שֵׁדִים Shedim. This word in the singular form, is one of the divine names, and signifies The All Bountiful. "I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac & to Jacob as אֵל שַׁדַּי Baal Shedi, The Lord All Bountiful. The heathens worshipped the genial powers of Nature under this name, giving it a plural form, as the Breeders forth of all the bountiful productions of the earth. But as their principles must have a material form these Genial Powers were represented by Multimamiæ or many-

Translations. (Apr. 1881.)

Και μακαριος εστιν ὃς εαν μη σκανδαλισθη εν εμοι.
And blessed is he whosoever not stumbles in me.
From Matt. 11. ch 6v. "And blessed is he,
who shall not be offended in me.

Kai	means	And
Macharios	"	blessed
estin	"	is he
os	"	who-
ean	"	soever
schandalistha	"	shall ~~not~~
(First fut. of offend)		be offended
ma	means	not
en	"	in
Emoi	"	obj.c. me

This passage is found in Matt. 11. v. 6. "And blessed "is he whosoever "shall not be offended "in me".
Translated
Mar. 27. 1881.
O. C. Hampton

Apr. 10. Sat. Lesson Matt. Chap. XIV. v. 7.

Ὅθεν μεθ ὅρκου ὡμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ὃ ἐαν
Hothen meth orkou homologesen autē dounai ho ean
Wherefore with oath he swore to agree to

αἰτήσηται
aitēsētai